

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Rickey B. Jones,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	Civil Action No.: 8:10-cv-2013-TLW-JDA
	)	
Michael J. Astrue,	)	
Commissioner of Social Security,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER**

The plaintiff, Rickey B. Jones (“plaintiff”), brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 405(g) and 1383(c)(3) to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the defendant, Commissioner of Social Security (“Commissioner” or “defendant”), denying his claims for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Jacquelyn D. Austin, to whom this case had previously been assigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Commissioner’s decision be reversed pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and that the case be remanded to the Commissioner for further administrative action consistent with the Report. (Doc. # 16). The defendant filed objections to the Report. (Doc. # 18). In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party may file written objections . . . . The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a de novo determination of those portions of the report

or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the report and recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 16). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the Commissioner's decision is **REVERSED** pursuant to sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), and this case is remanded to the Commissioner for further administrative action consistent with the Report.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Terry L. Wooten  
United States District Judge

March 14, 2012

Florence, South Carolina